

Chrono

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT (Optional)

EXTENSION

NO.

OL 2034-84

STAT

DATE

21 MAR 1984

STAT

TO: Officer designation, room number, and building

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

1. D/OLL

2. D 43 Hqs

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Central Intelligence Agency



Washington, D.C. 20505

20 MAR 1984

Enclosed is a copy of the summary minutes of the fifth meeting of the CIA Traffic Advisory Committee. Community position papers submitted in response to the issues discussed at this meeting have been incorporated into the minutes by attachment.

Also enclosed is a copy of a supplement to Technical Memorandum No. 2 which responds to a request to provide a restatement of the planning assumptions underlying the traffic analysis.

Sincerely,



Chairman
CIA Traffic Advisory Committee

STAT

Enclosures:

1. CIA TAC Minutes
2. Supplement to Technical
Memorandum No. 2

OL 2034-84

CIA Traffic Advisory Committee Members

STAT

OL/NBPO/ [] (20 Mar 84)

Distribution:

- Orig - Lilla Richards, MCA (w/encs)
- Orig - Gloria Adams, Alt., MCA (w/encs)
- Orig - Kent A. Maxfield, Ad Hoc Cte (w/encs)
- Orig - Patricia Blood, Alt., Ad Hoc Cte (w/encs)
- Orig - John F. Byrne, Geo Wash Mem Pkwy (w/encs)
- Orig - Donald E. Keith, VDH&T (w/encs)
- Orig - Donald Bozarth, NCPC (w/encs)
- Orig - Shiva K. Pant, FFCo Ofc of Trans (w/encs)
 - 1 - bcc S. R. Conley, VDH&T (w/encs)
 - 1 - bcc Nancy Bennett, Cong Wolf's Ofc (w/encs)
 - 1 - bcc Nancy Falck, FFCo Supervisor (w/encs)
 - 1 - bcc John P. Fowler, II, Dewberry & Davis (w/encs)
 - 1 - DD/A (w/encs)
 - 1 - D/PAO (w/encs)
 - ~~1~~ - D/OLL (w/encs)
 - 1 - D/OL (w/encs)
 - 1 - OL/NBPO (w/encs) Official File

Minutes of CIA Traffic Advisory Committee Meeting
13 March 1984

1. The fifth meeting of the CIA Traffic Advisory Committee was held on 13 March 1984 at 2:30 p.m. at the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation (VDH&T) Residence Office, Chain Bridge Road, Fairfax, Virginia.
2. The Chairman opened the meeting by stating that the purpose of this meeting was to focus on selection of alternatives for improvement of the Route 123-CIA-Route 193 interchange.
3. Mr. Maxfield of the Ad Hoc Committee stated his objection to this plan. He offered a position paper prepared by his Committee that emphasizes continuing concern that more significant improvements be made to CIA access from the George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP). He also reiterated his belief that answers to the Parkway-Beltway interchange dilemma should precede decisions on improvements to Route 123. He also remains of the opinion that safety improvements to Route 193 should be considered as part of the CIA expansion.
4. The Chairman stated that there was acceptance of the fact that Mr. Maxfield was in disagreement with the planning methodology being used. It is also understood that there are remaining issues concerning the Parkway and Route 193. However, the purpose of the meeting was to narrow the list of alternatives for the Route 123 improvements so that Dewberry and Davis could proceed with preliminary designs.
5. Mr. Keith proposed that one of the selected designs should be alternative 4 as described in Technical Memorandum No. 2 for CIA Expansion. It is the opinion of VDH&T that this alternative provides the best engineering solution. Mr. Pant, Fairfax County representative, stated that the County was in agreement with VDH&T that alternative 4 was the best selection.
6. Mr. Bozarth of the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) stated that the Commission Staff was of a different view. Mr. Bozarth stated that the Commission had engaged a consultant to assist in their review of the CIA traffic studies. Based on their consultant's findings combined with their internal deliberations, the NCPC Staff recommended that alternatives 1, 2, 2A, and 3 were the most promising alternatives. He stated that there was a particular concern for the level of service E afforded some CIA traffic under alternative 4.
7. Neither the McLean Citizens Association nor the Ad Hoc Committee were prepared to offer recommendations on design alternatives. However, each organization offered position papers containing design features felt necessary in a final design solution. The Chairman suggested that these features be used to identify a design alternative most closely responsive to these needs. Using the issues and concerns stated in the attached position papers, the Chairman suggested that alternative 2 most closely resembled the solution described by the suggested design features.

Minutes of CIA Traffic Advisory Committee Meeting - 13 March 1984

8. Mr. Maxfield stated that he was not in complete agreement with this suggestion since it was the Ad Hoc Committee's position that providing a two-way connection between Route 123 and Route 193 was undesirable. Mrs. Richards stated that she felt such a connection was needed to provide access to and from Route 193 for residents living South of Route 123. It was agreed that this was one design issue that Dewberry and Davis would study closely in the preliminary design.

9. Mr. Maxfield again stated that there is heavy opposition to the planned widening of Route 123 to six lanes. The Chairman stated his understanding of the opposition and suggested that the preliminary design may show that the widening is clearly related to growth in background traffic and not due to CIA expansion. This may be demonstrated by the phased construction plan which might show that the 1986 construction required for CIA expansion does not necessitate a third through lane on Route 123. In that case, the problem would be an issue between the community and the regional planners.

10. Mr. Maxfield stated that he would be opposed to doing anything in 1986 that is predicated on a plan for a six-lane cross section on Route 123. The Chairman stated that delivering a road design to VDH&T that the State believes they can live with is a requirement on CIA. This would mean delivering a 1986 design that would be compatible with the State plan for 2005. This does not necessarily mean that the 1986 project would expend money in preparation for a six-lane cross section. Mrs. Richards pointed out that in case ramps are involved, the 1986 construction would require construction of ramps capable of a three-lane cross section. She pointed out that there are examples of this policy in other areas of the County that demonstrate the cost effectiveness of such planning.

11. The Chairman suggested that the preliminary design go forward using alternatives 2 and 4 of the Technical Memorandum No. 2 as the basis for further design. This represents the recommended solution of VDH&T and the at-grade alternative most responsive to community concerns. Copies of the most current community position papers will be provided to Dewberry and Davis to serve as design guides in further development of these two candidate designs. The consultant will attempt to resolve as many of the community issues and concerns as practical during the next phase of the design.

12. Mr. Fowler of Dewberry and Davis stated that he estimates the preliminary design phase will last approximately 30 days.

13. Mr. Maxfield asked what action would be taken on the Ad Hoc Committee recommendation to provide a visitor center on Turkey Run Road and expand/improve a main entrance on the GWMP. The Chairman stated that the consultant would be asked to review the proposal and comment on its relative merits.

14. In response to a question concerning CIA project schedules, the Chairman stated that the final design package for the building was scheduled to be submitted to the NCPC in early April. Mr. Bozarth stated that this would suggest a formal Commission hearing on the request for final project approval in either early or late May. He stated that the meeting would include a report on the status of the road improvements by CIA and, if possible, VDH&T or their consultant. Citizen requests to be heard would also be considered.

15. The Chairman also stated that bids for the first construction contract had been opened on 13 March 1984 and that a contract was estimated for mid-April.

16. The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:30 p.m.

Attachments:

1. List of Attendees
2. McLean Citizens Association Letter Dated 9 March 1984
3. Ad Hoc Committee Letter Dated 12 March 1984
4. Clearview Manor Citizens Association Letter Dated 21 February 1984

Attendees
Fifth Meeting - CIA Traffic Advisory Committee
13 March 1984

Name	Representing	Telephone
BENNETT, Nancy	Congressman Wolf	225-5135
BLOOD, Patricia	Ad Hoc Committee, Alternate	734-0864
BOZARTH, Donald	National Capital Planning Comm	724-0185
CONLEY, S. R.	VDH&T - Richmond, Virginia	(804) 786-2551
DuBOIS, Joan	Supervisor Nancy Falck's Office	356-0551
FOWLER, John P., II	Dewberry & Davis	849-0291
HUNTZINGER, Steve	Dewberry & Davis	849-0420
KEITH, Donald E.	VDH&T - Northern Virginia	273-0660
MAXFIELD, Kent A.	Ad Hoc Committee	998-0600
McFADYEN, John	Lee Califf of Senator Warner's Ofc	224-2023
	CIA	
PANT, Shiva K.	Fairfax Co. Ofc of Transportation	691-3311
RICHARDS, Lilla	McLean Citizens Association	821-8795
ROBERTS, Kitty L.	GW Memorial Parkway	285-2600
SMITH, Steve	JHK & Associates	370-2411

STASTAT

McLEAN CITIZENS ASSOCIATION

P. O. BOX 273
McLEAN, VIRGINIA 22101

March 9, 1984

STAT

[Redacted]
New Building Project Office 4E50
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, D. C. 20505

Dear [Redacted]

STAT

Enclosed is a copy of the position adopted by the Board of Directors of the McLean Citizens Association on Technical Memorandum No. 2. We regret our inability to narrow the alternatives further, but we are still getting very mixed signals from the neighborhoods most directly affected.

It would be helpful to all concerned if the CIA could provide a written interim report on its study of the proposal to move the visitors center and therefore the main entrance to the Parkway side of the property. The report should include present and projected travel patterns of employees.

As you are well aware, the McLean Citizens Association would like to see as much traffic as possible shifted to the Parkway, and off Routes 123 and 193.

As for Georgetown Pike, we hope the Agency will join us at the April 13 hearing by the Virginia Commission for Highways and Transportation to ask for funds for safety improvements on the Pike. It will be held at 1:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the City of Fairfax, 10455 Armstrong Street.

Sincerely,



Lilla D. McC. Richards
MCA Representative to the
CIA Traffic Advisory Committee

McLean Citizens Association
Board of Directors Position On
Analysis of Roadway Improvement Alternatives
CIA Expansion Study, Technical Memorandum No. 2

Memorandum #2 gives three preliminary alternatives for improvements of the Parkway intersection with the Beltway, and eight alternatives for improvements of intersections on Dolley Madison Boulevard near the entrance to the CIA. From discussions so far, we believe the best solution in each of these two major problem areas will probably be a combination of parts of the alternatives so far shown. Therefore, we would prefer at this point to state our objectives (not in any order of priority), rather than recommend which specific numbered alternatives should be further studied. However, we do agree that 5, 6, and 7 have few redeeming features and should be dropped at this point. The CIA is encouraged to consider development of additional alternatives which conform to the objectives cited below.

I. Parkway intersection with Beltway. VDH&T improvements to coincide with Maryland's widening of the Cabin John Bridge must provide for exclusive lanes for traffic exiting from the Parkway towards Maryland and towards Virginia.

II. CIA Parkway entrance. Entrance ramps to the Parkway must be improved with Federal funds in both directions, but especially northbound, to speed merge with Parkway traffic and encourage use of this exit.

III. CIA Dolley Madison Boulevard entrances.

- A. At-grade intersections for CIA's access to Dolley Madison Boulevard should be studied further.
- B. Grade separation of CIA's access to Dolley Madison Boulevard should be studied further, provided that the ramps are no higher than the existing grade of the eastbound lanes of Route 123.
- C. At-grade intersections for Georgetown Pike's access to Dolley Madison Boulevard should be studied further.
- D. Georgetown Pike's access to Dolley Madison Boulevard should not be by grade separation unless and until safety improvements consistent with the Pike's status as a Virginia Scenic and Historic Byway have been made.

- E. Sight distance should be improved along Route 193 from the Beltway to Route 123, with particular emphasis on the intersection of Chain Bridge Road and Georgetown Pike (Langley Fork) where the hill should be topped.
 - F. Turkey Run Farm Park Road should be enhanced to serve as an expanded secondary access to the CIA, using landscaping, etc., to maintain its suitability as an access road to Turkey Run Farm Park.
 - G. The intersection of Dolley Madison Boulevard and Potomac School Road should be controlled by a traffic signal. The signal will have downstream benefits for traffic entering/exiting Savile Lane and Merchant Lane.
 - H. The main stem of Dolley Madison Boulevard should remain at four through lanes, two in each direction. One additional turning lane may be added in each direction close to the entrance to the CIA, provided that there is no encroachment on residential neighborhoods.
 - I. Maximum use should be made of earth berms and landscaping to buffer residential areas from visual or noise impacts of grade separations and lane shifts.
 - J. Route 123 should be relocated north essentially as contemplated in Technical Memorandum #2, Alternative 3. One benefit would be improved sight-distance. However, there should be no unacceptable weaving section in the last block approaching Merchant Lane and Savile Lane and a safe "crossover" width should be provided.
 - K. There should be no overhead signs.
 - L. There should be no overhead lights on ramps.
 - M. Adequate acceleration and deceleration lanes should be provided for Merchant Lane, Savile Lane, and Potomac School Road traffic.
 - N. Any additional alternatives developed which require additional rights-of-way should be structured to utilize government lands.
- IV. This is not the final position of the MCA Transportation Committee, and does not negate positions of individual surrounding citizens associations.

MARCH 7, 1984

March 12, 1984

Ad Hoc Committee for Off-Site CIA
Traffic Improvement

MEMORANDUM

TO: CIA Traffic Advisory Committee
ATTN:

STAT

SUBJECT: Technical Memorandum No. 2 for the CIA Expansion

In response to the Technical Memorandum prepared by Dewberry and Davis and jhk and associates, the Ad Hoc Committee (consisting of the Clearview Manor, Country Day School, Downscresc, Evermay, Langley Oaks, and Lynwood communities) unanimously supports the following outline of objectives for off-site road improvements which will impact on the surrounding communities:

1. GW Memorial Parkway should be improved to accommodate the increased traffic as a result of the expansion. A unified entrance, combining the entrances at GW Memorial Parkway and Turkey Run Farm Park Road, should be utilized, and the Visitors Center should be relocated to this unified entrance.
2. Safety at three intersections is of paramount concern. These three intersections are: (1) Route 123/Merchant Lane/Savile Lane; (2) Route 123/Potomac School Road, and (3) Route 193/Langley Fork.

Any road design should specifically address the safety requirements at these three intersections. To accommodate these requirements, we believe the following should be done as a package because they are interrelated. To the extent that one or more of the requirements cannot be accomplished within this concept, we want to know the full range of options for trade-offs that would be necessary for any parts that may be in conflict:

- o Maintain Route 123 as a four lane highway and Route 193 as a two lane highway.
- o To improve sight distance at Merchant Lane/Savile Lane (and reduce the pollution effect on the immediate communities), move the east bound lane of Route 123 north per the outline in Alternative #2 of Technical Memorandum #2.

- o Install traffic lights at Potomac School Road/Route 123 and at Route 123/Merchant Lane/Savile Lane.
 - o Langley Fork should be regraded to provide safer sight distance and Route 193 from the Beltway to Route 123 should have major road upgrades to provide better visibility, shoulder improvements, etc.
 - o All intersections should be at grade. If grade separation is required, underpasses should be constructed to avoid raising the current grade levels. There should be no flyovers. There should be no overpasses.
 - o We would prefer that the current one-way link between Route 193 and Potomac School Road be eliminated. If, however, this is not possible within the context of the above objectives, it should not, in any case, be more than a one-lane, one-way link between Route 193 and Route 123, as it currently is.
 - o There should be additional and/or improved acceleration and deceleration lanes at the intersections of Potomac School Road/Merchant Lane/Savile Lane.
3. Improvements to the Beltway at the GW Memorial Parkway interchange should provide for an exclusive lane for traffic exiting from the Parkway towards Maryland and towards Virginia.
 4. Improvements to the Beltway at the GW Memorial Parkway interchange should be accomplished to coincide with Maryland's widening of the Cabin John Bridge.
 5. There should be no overhead signs. When new alternatives are submitted for review, they should have appropriate elevation markings, proper annotations to show placement of roadway signs, lights, etc.
 6. There should be no overhead lights on any ramps (if ramps are used).
 7. Maximum use should be made of earth berms and landscaping to buffer residential areas from visual or noise impacts of grade separations and lane shifts.
 8. Any additional alternatives developed which address Routes 123/193 should be structured to accommodate the objectives above; however, we strongly advocate that one or more alternatives be structured to utilize the GW Memorial Parkway as the primary roadway for the CIA expansion.

9. If on-site parking becomes a problem for CIA employees, CIA should discourage its employees from parking off-site, support such local or state legislation and/or ordinances which may be needed to require permit parking in nearby communities, and will attempt to obtain authority and funding necessary to expand on-site parking capacity.
10. The objectives outlined herein should be incorporated into a revised regional transportation plan. This plan should be accomplished through the joint efforts of the local government, state and federal governments, and local citizens. It should incorporate the latest, up-to-date traffic data and analysis available. The plan should not delay the transportation designs and expansion plans of the CIA.

BY:

Lee Van Bremen
Lee Van Bremen, President, Clearview Manor

Dorothy B McCormick
Mrs. Dorothy McCormick, Owner, Country Day School

Eugene Kilcullen
Eugene Kilcullen, President, Downscrest

Maurice Whalen
Maurice Whalen, President, Evermay

Andrew Johnson
Andrew Johnson, President, Langley Oaks

Sharon Godfrey
Mrs. Sharon Godfrey, Representative, Lynwood

CLEARVIEW MANOR CITIZENS ASSOCIATION
1232 Somerset Drive
McLean, Virginia 22101

February 21, 1984

STAT

[REDACTED]
New Building Project Office
Office of Logistics
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, D.C. 20505

Re: Technical Memorandum No. 2
CIA Expansion Study

Dear [REDACTED]

STAT

Clearview Manor Citizens Association offers the following comments on Technical Memorandum No. 2 on the CIA Expansion Study prepared by Dewberry & Davis and JHK Associates for the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation. The following comments reflect the unanimous opinion of Association members who attended a meeting on February 20, 1984 at which time the results and projections of Technical Memorandum No. 1 were explained and the alternatives in Technical Memorandum No. 2 were reviewed. The primary recommendations of the Association are as follows:

- ° Do not widen Rt. 123 to six lanes between Potomac School Road and Merchant Lane;
- ° Adopt an alternative which relocates Rt. 123 eastbound (toward G.W. Parkway) parallel and adjacent to Rt. 123 westbound (toward McLean);
- ° Adopt an alternative which incorporates a traffic light at the Rt. 123-Potomac School Road intersection;
- ° Do not include a grade separation for the intersection of Rt. 193 and Rt. 123; and
- ° Provide a right turn lane into and out of Merchant Lane from and onto Rt. 123 east bound.

STAT

February 21, 1984
Page Two

Our views concentrate on the alternatives proposed for Route 123 between Potomac School Road and the G.W. Parkway because this portion of the study most directly affects us. However, our silence with respect to problems and alternatives relating to the G.W. Parkway and its merge with the Beltway should not be interpreted as agreement with the lack of effective solutions in those areas of the study. We do endorse the proposal to improve the CIA entrance ramp to the G.W. Parkway westbound be adopted. Tech Memo No. 2, p. 42.

Before discussing our recommendations in detail, we wish to point out that Clearview Manor represents an area of approximately 110 homes which use Merchant Lane as their primary entrance and exit road. The Association has a direct interest in this issue and has actively participated in its resolution. We are a member of the Ad Hoc Committee for Traffic To/From the CIA and are represented on the CIA Traffic Advisory Committee. Members of the Association have attended meetings of the McLean Citizens Association and representatives of CIA have met with our Association to explain the project. In summary, our comments are supported by careful review of the data available by our representatives as well as by daily encounters with Route 123 traffic by our entire membership. This includes children using Fairfax County school buses entering Rt. 123 from Merchant Lane.

Six Lanes for Route 123. We are strongly opposed to increasing Route 123 to six lanes at this time. The study (Tech Memo No. 2, p. 29) concludes that a four-lane Rt. 123 will not be adequate to handle traffic in year 2005. While this may be a premature conclusion not supported by the facts, our primary concern is with constructing six lanes between Potomac School Road and Merchant Lane before Rt. 123 is expanded to six lanes beyond those two intersections. The study does not address when or if this would happen. As a result, there would be a six lane bulge for a short distance with traffic compressed back to four lanes beyond those points. This seems very dangerous and ill-advised.

Furthermore, the compression on eastbound Route 123 would occur at the Merchant Lane intersection which is already hazardous (per those who use it every morning). For

STAT

February 21, 1984
Page Three

example, Alternative 4 (Tech Memo No. 2, Fig. 9) would merge three lanes from Rt. 123 east with two lanes from Rt. 19~~8~~3 east, i.e., five lanes into three lanes, just west of Merchant Lane; at, or just east of, Merchant Lane these three surviving lanes (and vehicles) would compress into two lanes heading east to the G.W. Parkway. Those who reside in Clearview Manor exiting onto Rt. 123 in the morning would be confronted with three lanes of traffic (which has just been compressed from five lanes), including two lanes from Rt. 193 which we cannot see because of the curve in Rt. 123. This, we respectfully submit, is an imposing task not to be undertaken lightly.

It should also be noted that widening Rt. 123 east bound to six lanes all the way to the Kirby Road, G.W. Parkway complex does not resolve the problem. This is the critical bottleneck with room for only two lanes -- one continuing down Rt. 123 toward Chain Bridge and one entering eastbound G.W. Parkway (toward D.C.). What happens to the third lane? In a comparable situation, the study rejects widening the G.W. Parkway from the CIA to the Beltway because this "would not increase capacity at the most critical points," that is, at the merge with the Beltway. See Tech Memo No. 2, p. 6. This is likewise true for Route 123. The bottleneck at the G.W. Parkway will remain so why enlarge Rt. 123 to six lanes until and unless the capacity at that critical point is increased?

Finally, we strongly object to the addition of another eastbound lane on Rt. 123 closer to the residents of Clearview Manor and Evermay. The roadway at this point is elevated above the homes creating a severe noise problem for the homes closest to Rt. 123. If a third lane is added even closer to those homes a bad situation would be aggravated. We believe that this would pose a substantial environmental impact that may not be resolvable given the less adverse and reasonable alternatives available. At a minimum, a significant additional expense would involve the erection of a noise reduction wall or fence.

Relocate Eastbound Route 123. We strongly recommend an alternative which would relocate Rt. 123 east so it is parallel and adjacent to Rt. 123 west. This has several obvious advantages.

STAT

February 21, 1984
Page Four

1. Safety at Merchant Lane will improve. We will have a clear line of vision for eastbound Rt. 123 traffic. The existing configuration offers a blind curve with only the briefest opportunity to gauge oncoming traffic before entering the fray.

2. Noise pollution in Evermay and Clearview Manor will improve. Route 123 eastbound is dangerously close to homes in both communities. Relocation parallel and adjacent to Rt. 123 west will take advantage of the topography. The old eastbound roadway is elevated and would serve as an existing berm to reduce noise in our communities.

While Alternatives 2, 2A, 3 and 4 (Tech Memo No. 2, Figs. 7, 8, 9) propose a relocation of eastbound Rt. 123, there are significant distinctions among them in terms of the two factors mentioned above.

Alternatives 2A and 4, while relocating Rt. 123 east, replace the old roadway with two lanes from Rt. 193 at a grade separation. These would then merge into three lanes from Rt. 123 east creating the extremely dangerous conditions at Merchant Lane discussed above. Under Alternatives 2A and 4, noise pollution would not improve, at least not significantly, and traffic safety at Merchant Lane would deteriorate considerably.

Alternatives 2 and 3 maximize traffic safety at Merchant Lane and significantly lessen the potential environmental impact and noise pollution.

Traffic Light at Potomac School Road and Rts. 193/123 Grade Separation. Our preference for alternatives which incorporate a traffic light at Potomac School Road (at least during AM rush hours) is directly linked to the study's preference, and that of VDH&T, for a grade separation at the merge of Rts. 193 and 123. The study treats the two concepts as incompatible. Alternatives 1, 2A, 4, 5 and 6 (Tech Memo No. 2, Figs. 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11) propose a grade separation and no light at Potomac School Road. Alternatives 2, 3 and 7 (Tech Memo No. 2, Figs. 7, 8 and 12) propose a light at Potomac School Road and no grade separation between Rts. 193 and 123.

STAT

February 21, 1984
Page Five

The basic rationale for a grade separation is explained in the study as follows. VDH&T policy and its regional planning prefer grade separation when an Urban Minor Arterial road (Rt. 193) intersects with an Urban Principal Arterial and Federal Aid Primary Highway (Rt. 123). Tech Memo No. 2, p. 43. While the consultants acknowledge that any six-lane alternative on Rt. 123 will accommodate traffic demand, a grade separation approach will reduce traffic delay and is therefore preferred. Tech Memo No. 2, p. 36. However, the facts accumulated in Technical Memorandum No. 1 do not support the need for a grade separation at the joinder of Rts. 193 and 123.

Technical Memorandum No. 1 studied existing traffic as well as projections for 1986 (when CIA expansion was assumed to be completed) and 2005 in the area of the CIA. These projections were the basis for a level of service analysis at various locations and the identification of several problem areas. Tech Memo No. 1, pp. 8, 12-13, Fig. 5. Of note is the fact that the existing at-grade intersection of Rts. 193 and 123 which is controlled by a traffic light was not identified as a problem area. This condition is confirmed in the study's level of service analysis. The peak AM level of service at the existing at-grade and light-controlled intersection of Rts. 193 and 123 is "A" and will only become level "B" by the year 2005. Tech Memo No. 1, Fig. 3. (Contrast this with the existing level of service on Rt. 123 eastbound during the AM rush hour which is "D" and will deteriorate to "F" in 2005. Id. A highway should operate at no worse than a level of service "D" during the peak period. Id. at p. 7).

The existing at-grade, light-controlled intersection between Rts. 193 and 123 works. There is no reason to think that it would not continue to work at a position slightly west on Rt. 123. Although plans exist to upgrade the safety of Rt. 193, no increased capacity will result since it has been designated a Virginia Historic Byway. Tech Memo No. 2, p. 6.

Thus, the facts do not warrant discarding a traffic light at the intersection of Potomac School Road and Routes 193 and 123. This we submit is essential for traffic safety. As noted in the study: "Under any of the alternatives, problems crossing Route 123 will continue to exist

STAT

February 21, 1984

Page Six

at Merchants (sic) Lane and Potomac School Road under unsignalized conditions." Tech Memo No. 2, p. 36. We wholeheartedly agree. We have already pointed out our concerns with traffic safety at Merchant Lane under certain of the alternatives. This concern is heightened when Alternatives 4, 5 and 6 are examined. Id., Figs. 9, 10 and 11. There would be no traffic light on Route 123 from Kirby Road to the heart of McLean. This, we submit, is a frightening and untenable prospect.

Conclusions. The consultants recommend Alternatives 2A and 4 as warranting further study, with Alternative 4 their apparent choice. Tech Memo No. 2, p. 43. We could not disagree more. Keeping in mind the five planning objectives unanimously endorsed by our Association, we find Alternatives 2A and 4 unacceptable for the following reasons:

- ° worst possible safety impact at Merchant Lane;
- ° no improvement in environmental concerns since roadways are not effectively relocated parallel and adjacent to westbound Route 123;
- ° no traffic light at Potomac School Road; and
- ° no right turn lane into Merchant Lane appears feasible because of merger of Rts. 123 and 193 just west of Merchant Lane.

We also note that Alternative 4 creates perhaps the shortest and least desirable weaving area between the CIA and Route 193. Tech Memo No. 2, p. 35.

Our review indicates that Alternatives 2 and 3 (Id., Figs. 7 and 8) most closely meet the basic planning objectives we have identified.

- ° drivers entering Rt. 123 from Merchant Lane will have a clear view of eastbound traffic;
- ° noise and environmental concerns will be minimized;

STAT

February 21, 1984
Page Seven

- traffic will be controlled by a light at Potomac School Road; and
- a turning lane into Merchant Lane appears compatible.

Therefore, we urge that Alternatives 2 and 3 be given further evaluation.

We appreciate the opportunity to present our comments on the alternatives discussed in Technical Memorandum No. 2. While we understand the CIA's desire to have the Advisory Committee reflect the unanimous opinion of its members, we trust that you will also understand and recognize the time constraints under which the several components of the Advisory Committee must function. We brought the issues before our Association members as promptly as possible and their unanimous views are expressed herein. We have not had an opportunity to review our conclusions with other members of the Advisory Committee; however, we do not anticipate any disagreements. Given the purpose of the February 21 meeting, which we understand is designed to select alternatives for further evaluation, we feel that the submission of this letter and its wide dissemination is appropriate.

Very truly yours,

CLEARVIEW MANOR CITIZENS
ASSOCIATION

By:

Lee Van Bremen

Lee Van Bremen
President

STAT

CIA ACCESS STUDY

SUPPLEMENT TO TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #2

ROADWAY NETWORK AND TRAFFIC PROJECTION ASSUMPTIONS
and
COMMENTS ON TRAFFIC GROWTH RATE

A. Highway Facility Assumptions for Year 2005

1. Cabin John Bridge widened to four lanes in each direction.
2. No widening of Route 193, with possible exception of turn lanes at critical intersections.
3. No widening of George Washington Parkway north of Spout Run.
4. Six lanes on Route 123 between Tyson's Corner and the George Washington Parkway.
5. Metro extended to Vienna.
6. Dulles Access Toll Road completed and functional.

B. Traffic Projection Assumptions

1. No growth in background (non-CIA) traffic between now and 1986. The basis for this assumption is the anticipated effect of improved roadway access in the I-66/Dulles Access Road corridor as well as the continued expansion of the Metrorail system.
2. An overall increase in traffic (background plus CIA expansion traffic) of approximately 1.5% per year on all roadways within the study area between 1986 and 2005. This rate of growth may be lower or higher for any given roadway in the study area based on its location and the relative impact of CIA traffic.
3. Given no capacity restraints, the distribution of CIA expansion traffic on roadways to and from the site is assumed to be the same as for existing CIA traffic.
4. The amount of additional traffic generated by the CIA expansion is based on the CIA's having implemented measures to contain traffic demand. First, the increase in the number of parking spaces is in conformance with guidelines suggested by the National Capital Planning Commission. Complementing

- 2 -

this will be strategies to substantially increase car-pooling efforts as well as staggering work arrival and departure times to reduce the conflict with other commuting traffic. Approximately 1,000 trips have been added to CIA traffic in each peak hour. This is approximately a 35% increase over existing levels and should be conservatively high given the types of demand reduction measures which are envisioned.

C. Notes on the Traffic Growth Rate

The assumed overall study area traffic growth rate of 1.5% per year was questioned at the Advisory Committee Meeting, particularly in reference to Route 123. Two points should be made regarding the growth rate on Route 123. First, as stated above, the 1.5% increase refers to the overall increase within the study area. The increase on any particular roadway varies from this average. For example, traffic westbound in the PM peak hour on Route 123, under the CR future condition, was projected to increase 67% over 20 years or 2.6% per year. Increases eastbound, and in the AM peak hour westbound, are typically between 1 and 1.5% per year.

The development of these forecasts is based on both historical trends in this specific study area and on future improvements expected in the regional highway network. For instance, between 1976 and 1982 traffic demand dropped approximately 5.7% on Route 123 and 9.4% on Route 193. Recently completed road construction has altered traffic patterns in the study area resulting in increased volumes on Route 123. Short term fluctuations in travel demand are accounted for in the long range projections.

In addition to this, other general evidence also suggests the reasonableness of the assumed growth rate. Typically, the highways closer to the downtown area experience less growth than the more rapidly developing outlying areas. One would therefore expect growth rates in the study area to be at the lower end of the scales. In addition, growth rates tend to decline as an area matures. The growth rate for this area ten years from now is likely to be somewhat less than it is today. The 1.5% growth rate is an average assumed over that twenty year period.